

the acquiescence of our Government had been sought, without much prospect of favor. These statements were carried at by blockheads, who are too stupid to conceal their ignorance, which is patent to everybody else, and against whom all the avenues of valuable intelligence are closed. Now, that the Atlantic has brought verification from the other side, perhaps their dull faculties will wake up to the reality of a fact which has now become notorious and officially public.

Mr. Herbert is released from nominal restraint, and at liberty to use the weapon which he has more than once employed for the redress of real or supposed grievances. Judge Crawford accepted this morning in the sum of \$10,000, and took occasion to offer some extrajudicial opinions, that might have been properly reserved. The killing is a fact; but what the trial and the verdict are to be is yet to be seen. There is a very general impression, if the living and the dead could change places, that the present circumstances would change with them. Suppose the Irish waiter had drawn a pistol after the blows and collision with Herbert, and the affair had terminated with the loss of the latter's life. Does anybody doubt that "justice" in such a case would have been swift in its vengeance, or perhaps have even been anticipated by more summary process? It is not to excite prejudice, but to illustrate how much the station of men may affect their lives and fortunes, that this suggestion is made.

One of the most painful features of this shocking affair is for such it is in every aspect—the absence of all sympathy, and almost of all tolerance of opinion for the unfortunate man who was so suddenly hurried into eternity. The Democratic side of the House—with honorable exceptions, of course—with all their affected devotion to the rights of the poor and the humble, and all their professed attachment to the exiles from foreign lands, and "our naturalized citizens," have not uttered a word in extenuation or justification of the obscure Irishman who was shot down like a mad dog. But they have been free in expressing the conviction that Mr. Herbert ought to have been relieved from custody, as he had suffered enough in feeling, from what was little more than a farce of incarceration.

A message was expected from the President this morning, concerning our affairs with Nicaragua, to be predicated upon the calls for information, passed by the Senate and House. But it did not come. The divisions in Cabinet and the opposition out of doors, have induced the President to pause before taking the final step. This communication with Congress—if the present intention be carried out—is designed to relieve some of the embarrassment occasioned by his inclination on one side, and his doubts on the other. For the real object is to invite such an expression as may seem to warrant recognition, in spite of the adverse influences now at work. That comfort will hardly be furnished, for notwithstanding the desire to urge the radical sentiment, which upholds and urges this policy, there is a strong undertow, which threatens disaster to the party, should it be adopted as a political principle. The conservative portion of the South repudiates the connection and spurns the bribe. The solid men of the North "spit upon" both. Congress will turn its back upon the suggestion.

In well informed circles, the opinion is strongly entertained, that the recent naval demonstration in England had a significant meaning, and that a possible solution, in the diplomatic way, to untie the Gordian knot. This parade had a purpose of some kind; but, if designed as a means of intimidation, just preceding the answer of the British Government to our demand, it has failed to effect its object. Two hundred and forty war-steamer are capable of considerable carnage and havoc, and let loose upon our commerce and coasts, would, for the first year, make us feel the full force of naval inferiority. But when four or five thousand privateers get to work fairly, each fighting on its own hook, dictating its own terms and pocketing its own spoils, perhaps the tables would be turned, by a sort of physical rapping that would soon come to be valued. But would the negotiators were to have good offices, in that philanthropic enterprise, to flow their disinterested virtue glimmers—like certain mackerel in moonshine!

THE "NATIONAL" WATER WORKS.

To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune.

SIR: The accompanying communication was prepared and sent to The Star, in this city, with a request that it be published, as that paper has frequently misconstrued the character and direction of the opposition, both in and out of Congress, to the project now being prosecuted by the General Government for supplying the cities of Washington and Georgetown with water. I have endeavored in that communication to touch some of the true grounds of that opposition; and, if you permit me a future opportunity, I will give extracts and estimates from the reports officially published on this subject contrasted with facts transpiring in the progress of this work, that shall justify every step taken by the opposition, and perhaps compel the journals of this District to discuss the question on its true merits, instead of introducing captious charges of venality or selfishness on every Member of Congress, and every citizen who dares say aught against "the nine foot bore." J. E. HOLMES.

Washington, May 10, 1856.

To the Editor of The Washington Star.

DEAR SIR: Yourself and the citizens of this city and Georgetown are doubtless convinced by this time that the prospects for a speedy and successful completion of the "National Water Works" are dreary and distant, and you may feel disposed to look into and discuss the merits of the whole question with more calmness and respect for the opinions of those outside of this District than you have recently been disposed to do.

The opposition to the "Great Falls" project rests on the extravagance of its conception and the arguments brought to sustain it, and on the well known opinions of engineers that the expenditure of money to make it a lasting and reliable work must be double that estimated for approving the construction of that work upon an "enlarged scale," because "it would introduce into the city, available for manufacturing purposes, a water-power of nearly 1,700 horses," must necessarily raise the question, is this a legitimate project for the Government to engage in? What will it cost? and whose money is to pay for it? So, too, a report that estimates a dam or "dike" of "rock thrown across the stream 1,341 feet in length" and "8 feet in height" on the brink of the Great Falls, "one of the great rivers of the continent," that rises sometimes more than 30 feet above "its ordinary level," at 25 per cent of the stone-work of such dam, does not impress engineers, contractors, or Members of Congress with any present or distant probability of such a work; and the opinion largely expressed is that a sum five times as large as that named for that dam must be expended before a year's consecutive supply from that source will ever reach this city.

So with estimates for the supply necessary for these cities, large manufacturing towns, surrounded by salt water, where marine and stationary steam-engines are puffing on every square and around every dock, and drawing supplies like "Leviathans that drink up a water at a draught," are taken as the basis of estimate for communities strictly social, and where, if manufactures ever spring up, they will mainly take supplies direct from the fresh water of the river, unless the Government shall supply it "without money or price."

The whole question rests here, and to this point will the people of these States hold their representatives: "What quantity of water does the Government need?" "for those directly connected with its administration?" "in these cities?" and how far should they go toward "supplying the citizens of these cities with water at a 'public expense'?" I hold that, as a citizen of Washington, I should have no more claims on the Government for water I need than I have as a citizen of Ohio, and that any convenience I might find supplied here in that line was a generous boon from my fellow-citizens in every section of the Union.

One thing is certain, \$500,000, judiciously expended, will supply constantly to the Government an abundance of pure water for all its necessities, and reasonable ornaments and fountains, while as much more, applied to enlargements of the means of supply, will for generations to come, afford the inhabitants of a

cheap rate, an opportunity to use as much pure water as they please to demand.

The report on the "Great Falls" project estimates as follows: "The entrance of the water to the water works, near 'Driver's Rest,' and exclusive of the 'High Service in Georgetown,' and the land for reservoirs, \$10,000, (\$30,000) all the Now for the balance of \$10,000, Georgetown, &c., with land, damage, high service in Georgetown, &c., may be made, ample provision for the largest demand, and I have refrained from allusion to the fact that the water, and entirely out of reach of the wash of the city. And even if the imagined population should ever exist, and the imagined wants arise, the pumping apparatus will be a necessary aid when dependence is placed on the dam, and works at the Great Falls of the Potomac.

I believe there is no strong opposition to any reasonable plan or expenditure for a proper supply of water for this age and generation; but while Philadelphia, a manufacturing city of more than half a million of inhabitants, is supplied with fifteen millions of gallons daily, it is hard to conceive the necessity for a supply of sixty-five millions for cities whose population is not in the least likely to be one-fourth so great.

I have hinted at some of the prominent reasons for the course of the Members of Congress that oppose the appropriation, and suggested a cheap and efficient remedy for that opposition. I shall the question be postponed indefinitely for a military cry among the people, or such steps be taken as will at once give the Government and citizens all they need, and all they may hope for?

The question is too important to rest on personalities, and I have refrained from allusion to my previous remarks, curiously willing to leave my own actions in this, or any other matter, to the criticism of my bitterest opponents. Respectfully,

JOSEPH E. HOLMES.

THE LATEST NEWS.

RECEIVED BY

MAGNETIC TELEGRAPH.

WALKER TO BE RECOGNIZED.

From Our Own Correspondent.

WASHINGTON, Tuesday, May 13, 1856. The President is decided on his purpose to receive Padre Vilij, the Minister sent to represent Walker's Government in Nicaragua. This purpose may be communicated in the Message answering the resolution of inquiry into Central American affairs. The opposition in the Cabinet seems not to have affected the President's inclination.

This step, if taken in connection with the dismissal of Mr. Crampton, the British representative here—which dismissal is now determined upon—it is believed by sagacious statesmen will have the effect of reviving Lord Palmerston's power, which is tottering to its fall, and of seriously complicating our relations with all the European Governments. Indeed, it cannot be disguised that the most momentous consequences may ensue, involving the peace of this country in various quarters, and inviting entanglements and disputes which cannot at this time be appreciated by the public. A profound sensation will necessarily be created throughout Europe, leading to new and formidable combinations against the United States. It is by far the gravest complication since the Oregon difficulty.

OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS.

From Our Own Correspondent.

WASHINGTON, Tuesday, May 13, 1856.

The mails by the America did not bring the expected reply to the demand for Mr. Crampton's recall, nor do they give any assurance when it would be communicated. There is a rare possibility that it may have been sent to Mr. Crampton, though at the last interview between Lord Clarendon and Mr. Buchanan on the subject, the former promised to submit it to our Legation, even if officially sent through Mr. Crampton. The Atlantic's correspondence was received this morning, but has not been thoroughly sifted.

The answer to the Senate's call for information in regard to Central American matters not heretofore communicated, will probably be ready to-morrow. The Clerks in the State Department were engaged till late last night in preparing extracts from correspondence and other documents. The public has already received the gist of this intelligence. Mr. Wheeler's dispatches will figure most voluminously.

Our Military Commission to the Crimea have made a lengthy and detailed official report to Secretary Davis of their interview with and treatment by Mr. Vaillant, the French War Minister, which has been formally submitted to the Secretary of State, and probably has formed the basis of a communication with Mr. Mason, the object being to elicit that explanation which it was supposed Mr. Mason would have required after first presentation of the facts.

The majority of the Supreme Court, in ordering the case involving the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise to go over till next term for argument, have not surprised those who observed its progress and the modifications of views occasioned by public opinion. The minority were prepared to meet the issue directly, and this postponement is little else than a convenient evasion.

ARREST OF GOV. ROBINSON OF KANSAS.

St. Louis, Tuesday, May 13, 1856.

Mrs. Robinson arrived here yesterday. This morning she published a statement respecting her husband's detention at Lexington. She says Gov. Robinson was going East on personal business, and denies that he was aware of the indictment previous to leaving the Territory. Otherwise her statement does not materially differ from yesterday's dispatch.

The Lawrence correspondent of The Democrat, under date the 7th inst., says an indictment for high treason had been found against Messrs. Reader, Robinson, Roberts, Lane, and other prominent Free-State men.

The news brought from Lawrence by Missourians is that secret handbills are circulating that forces are marshaling in the border counties, and that the people have been warned to prepare for defense.

FROM WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, Tuesday, May 13, 1856.

Mr. Buchanan arrived here this evening, accompanied by a Committee of the Baltimore Council. A large number of persons received him at the Railroad Station and walked him to the National Hotel, where he was greeted with much enthusiasm. Mr. Buchanan will be here till to-morrow, and will be accompanied to-night. He remains here ten days.

The impression that the new Nicaraguan Minister would be officially received by the President when he should present his credentials, is without a doubt well founded.

XXXIVTH CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.—WASHINGTON, May 12.

On motion of Mr. FISH, the Secretary of War was directed to report to the Senate an estimate for the removal of the rocks at Hurlgate, New-York, and for the removal of the passage of vessels of war, and the largest class merchantmen, and such other aids to navigation as may be deemed necessary, and that he should take an early opportunity to introduce a bill providing for carrying out the above object.

The Senate agreed to the report of the Committee of Conference on the Deficiency bill.

Mr. CASS concluded his speech, commenced yesterday, saying, with regard to Kansas, that the recent troubles in that Territory had not in the least weakened his faith in the great doctrine of the right of man to govern himself. He commenced the everlasting discussion of the slavery question, which was judiciously renewed with increased violence on the eve of each Presidential election. The South does not meddle with the social system of the North, and if the

North would follow its example we should be the happiest and most contented people on the face of the globe.

Mr. CLAYTON, speaking on the question of the Sound Docks, contended that this country ought no longer to submit to such an exaction. The treaty with Denmark had been abrogated, and nothing that the Government could do would restore it. The notice of the President was merely that for sixty days after the expiration of the year, this country would take no steps on the subject, but such notice did not revive the treaty. Adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. JONES, in reply to remarks by his colleague, Mr. FULDER, Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said that the Committee on the Judiciary, which framed and reported the bill, had no objection to the bill, and would not be bound by any attempt to defend it from attack on any quarter. Mr. FULDER (Pa.) gave the Democratic Journal of that State as the authority for his assertion that the Committee on the Judiciary had no objection to the bill, and would not be bound by any attempt to defend it from attack on any quarter. The House adopted the report of the Committee of Conference on the Deficiency bill, from which had been struck an appropriation of \$200,000 for the continuation of the Washington Aqueduct.

Two hundred and ten thousand copies of the agricultural portion of the Patent Office Report were ordered printed.

Mr. JONES depicted the fatal consequences to our Nationality, which must result from the continued agitation of the slavery question, and invoked the South to stand firm in an unbroken phalanx against the invaders of their constitutional rights. Adjourned.

THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE ON THE ADMISSION OF KANSAS.

Boston, Tuesday, May 13, 1856.

Resolutions in favor of the admission of Kansas under the Free State Constitution and declaring its speedy admission as a Free State a measure of the first importance to the welfare of the Territory and the tranquility and honor of the United States, were passed to a third reading in the Senate to-day by a vote of 26 to 2.

PENNSYLVANIA AMERICAN STATE CONVENTION.

HARRISBURG, Tuesday, May 13, 1856.

The Erie branch of Know-Nothings are holding a State Convention in this city, with closed doors. Sixty delegates are said to be in attendance, among whom are Gov. Johnston and Gen. Small. A. W. Benedict, ex-president of the Convention, is in the city, and is doing all in his power to bring about a reconciliation between the two wings of the party.

Mr. Edie presided at the afternoon session. Gen. Small offered resolutions ratifying the admission of Kansas under the Free State Constitution, and denouncing the Kansas-Nebraska act as an outrage on the people.

Gov. Johnston offered a substitute approving the act of the Legislature, and retired from the Philadelphia Convention and the calling of a convention at New-York for the 12th of June.

After the debate the substitute was rejected, and the resolutions adopted by a vote of thirty-three to twenty-two.

Mr. Johnston and fourteen other Edie delegates retired.

Mr. Edie moved a reconsideration, in order to give Mr. Fillmore time to get right on the Missouri question. Rejected.

A resolution to make future meetings open was passed. Adjourned sine die.

The Edie delegates subsequently held a public meeting, the Hon. John Covode presiding. An address is being prepared to the people of the State.

INAUGURATION OF A MAYOR.

PHILADELPHIA, Tuesday, May 13, 1856.

Mayor Vaux was inaugurated at noon to-day. The oath was administered by Judge Thompson. The Mayor made a brief speech, saying he would make no promises, except that he would administer the laws as he understood them, and to the best of his ability.

DISTURBANCE AT AURNERS' CELEBRATION.

CINCINNATI, Tuesday, May 13, 1856.

While the German Turners of this city were celebrating their anniversary at Covington (Ky.), they were interrupted by a mob of Americans, who attacked them, and drove them from the place. The Turners were badly beaten, and several of them were injured. The mob then proceeded to the residence of the Turners, and destroyed their property.

Tree-planting has become quite a mania here this Spring, and the maple and elm are fast taking the places of the old decayed locusts, which, I am grieved to say, were once the favorites of our villages. Strange, passing strange, that the people run to locust trees so much, to the neglect of the maple and the elm, which are so beautiful and so useful.

More lately trees had been set out some twenty years ago, instead of the former, our village now would have been one of the most lovely spots in all creation—I mean so far as this world is concerned. Our ladies last season took "The Old Camp Ground" in hand, raised funds, built a beautiful and substantial fence around it, and provided the means of further improving it this Spring. The grounds are now handsomely graded, beautiful walks made over them, and hundreds of maples and elms now ornament the spot, which, by the way, commands one of the most picturesque and beautiful points of view in our whole country. But people to be found in our whole country. But people to be found in our whole country. But people to be found in our whole country.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

WASHINGTON, Tuesday, May 13, 1856.

Nos. 257 and 258.—C. Brown, Jr., plaintiff, vs. John J. Warren, administrator of James Brown, Jr., deceased, and same plaintiff vs. Thos. J. Morrie and wife, tutor and tutrix of the minor children of James Brown, Jr. The cases were docketed and dismissed with costs.

Nos. 12 and 114.—Edward Field vs. Pardon G. Seabury, and same vs. same. Argument concluded for the defendants by Mr. Holladay.

Nos. 77 and 78.—Arguella vs. the United States. The cases were docketed and dismissed with costs.

Nos. 81 and 82.—Alexander Dennistoun & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 83 and 84.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 85 and 86.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 87 and 88.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 89 and 90.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 91 and 92.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 93 and 94.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 95 and 96.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 97 and 98.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 99 and 100.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 101 and 102.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 103 and 104.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 105 and 106.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 107 and 108.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 109 and 110.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 111 and 112.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 113 and 114.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 115 and 116.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 117 and 118.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 119 and 120.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 121 and 122.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 123 and 124.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 125 and 126.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 127 and 128.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 129 and 130.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 131 and 132.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 133 and 134.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 135 and 136.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 137 and 138.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 139 and 140.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 141 and 142.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 143 and 144.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 145 and 146.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 147 and 148.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 149 and 150.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 151 and 152.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 153 and 154.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 155 and 156.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 157 and 158.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 159 and 160.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 161 and 162.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 163 and 164.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 165 and 166.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 167 and 168.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 169 and 170.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 171 and 172.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.

Nos. 173 and 174.—James Stewart & Co., plaintiffs, vs. Roger Stewart. The case came before the Court on a certificate of a division of opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of Alabama, affirming the decree of the District Court for the Northern District of California.